REMARKS

In the Office Action dated January 26, 2005, claims 1, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17-23, 27, 30, 31 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Taguchi et al.

Applicants note with appreciation that claims 2-6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16, 24-26, 28, 29 and 32-37 were stated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form, however, the above rejection is respectfully traversed and therefore these claims have been retained in dependent form at this time.

The method and reception unit disclosed and claimed in the present application are concerned with combining *received* magnetic resonance response signals so that a primary mode and a secondary mode can be generated from the same received signals. The Taguchi et al reference, by contrast, is concerned almost exclusively with combining signals or waveforms in various ways to produce different types of *transmitted* signals, i.e., the signals that are *emitted* by the RF transmitter in order to create the magnetic resonance response signals. The Taguchi et al reference provides virtually no teachings whatsoever as to how the *received* magnetic response signals are processed. The passages in the Taguchi et al reference specifically cited by the Examiner in support of the aforementioned anticipation rejection, in particular, all are concerned exclusively with the formulation of signals to be transmitted, and have nothing whatsoever to do with the processing of *received* magnetic resonance signals.

Independent claims 17 and 22 as originally filed each specifically referred to *received* signals, and independent method claim 1 has been amended to move language from the preamble thereof to follow the word "comprising" so that claim 1 as well affirmatively refers to receiving the magnetic resonance response signals that are processed in the manner set forth in the remainder of claim 1.

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner cited language in the Taguchi et al reference at column 7, lines 29-42 as allegedly disclosing the method step of forming at least two modes for a magnetic resonance imaging apparatus from at least two magnetic resonance response signals respectively with at least two local antennas. Applicants acknowledge that this was the original language in the preamble of claim 1, which did not explicitly state "*received* with at least two local antennas," however, as noted above claim 1 has now been amended to make this clear, and original claims 17 and 22 already included an explicit statement that the signals being processed were *received* signals. The Examiner did not separately apply the Taguchi et al reference against the other independent claims, but only tracked the language of claim 1 with regard to the teachings of Taguchi et al. Although the Examiner may have felt justified in applying the Taguchi et al reference against claim 1 as originally filed, there was no basis whatsoever for applying Taguchi et al against independent claims 17 and 22.

The language cited by the Examiner at column 7, lines 29-42 of Taguchi et al refers to simultaneously *exciting* two slices and calculating the images from two kinds of signal data having different *modes of excitation*. This passage further states that the gist of the Taguchi et al invention is that two slices are *excited* simultaneously, and is also concerned with how two different kinds of *excitation* are carried out.

The Examiner also cited language at column 4, lines 22-28 and lines 29-32 as allegedly corresponding to further steps in claim 1. As noted above, even if the

Examiner believed it was justifiable to apply these teachings of Taguchi et al against the language of original claim 1, there was no basis whatsoever for doing so with regard to independent claims 17 and 22.

The language in the Taguchi et al reference at column 4, beginning with line 22, refers to *analog* signals, which are clearly the transmitted signals. This is further made clear by the teachings in this passage that the analog signal undergoes amplitude modulation, which of course is an action that takes place only with respect to a transmitted signal. At column 4, lines 27-28, it is explicitly stated that this amplitude modulated signal is irradiated by the coil 305 to generate an RF magnetic field, again making clear that this passage refers to *transmitted* signals. This is made even more clear by the next two paragraphs in column 4 of Taguchi et al, which describe different embodiments (in Figure 4 and Figure 5 of Taguchi et al) of RF magnetic field *generators* for emitting the RF signal described in the paragraph beginning at column 4, line 8.

In column 2, lines 23-31 of Taguchi et al., the basic operating concept disclosed therein is summarized, which involves simultaneous excitation and measurement of slices by generating an RF magnetic field mainly having Fourier COS components, and an RF magnetic field having Fourier SIN components. Nothing unusual or novel is needed to *receive* signals arising from these different types of RF fields, which is why the Taguchi et al reference is almost completely silent as to anything that occurs with regard to *reception* of the signals.

The Taguchi et al reference, therefore, does not disclose all of the method steps of amended claim 1, and does not disclose all of the method steps of original claim 17, nor all of the elements of original claim 22. The Taguchi et al reference therefore does not anticipate any of those claims, nor any of the claims respectively depending therefrom.

All claims of the application are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Submitted by,
Steven H. Noll (Reg. 28,982)
SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP
CUSTOMER NO. 26574
Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312/258-5790
Attorneys for Applicants.

CH1\ 4239798.1